

FINAL REPORT

Children and Family Services Review

Western Service Area

10th Mini CFSR Review

Period Under Review: April 1st, 2011 – April 1st, 2012

Report Date: April 2012

Executive Summary
Final Report: Children and Family Services Review (CFSR)
Western Service Area – 10th Mini CFSR Review

This document presents the findings from the 10th Mini-Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Western Service Area. The Nebraska CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) team has identified Mini-CFSR as an important activity for assessing the performance of each service area and the state as a whole with regard to achieving positive outcomes for children and their families. The Mini-CFSR is scheduled to take place in each service area, quarterly beginning in the year 2010.

The Western Service Area's 10th Mini-CFSR was conducted from April 3 to 5, 2012. The period under review for the onsite case review was April 1, 2011 to April 1, 2012. The findings were derived from file reviews of 14 cases (8 foster care and 6 in home services) which were randomly selected from all child welfare cases which were open at some time during the period under review. The reviews also included interviews with parents, children, foster parents, CFS specialists, and other service providers to assess Items 17-20 within the review tool.

In the Western Service Area, 2 of the 14 cases reviewed were brought to the attention of DHHS for juvenile justice services and 5 of the cases were non court involved. Cases reviewed were from the following local offices: Gering, Lexington, McCook, North Platte, and Ogallala.

The first level reviews of the cases were completed by 8 staff from DHHS. A second level review of 100% of the cases was completed by Lori Posvar, Quality Assurance Program Specialist, DHHS.

Background Information

The mini CFSR is modeled after the Federal CFSR and assesses the service area's performance on 23 items relevant to seven outcomes.

With regards to outcomes, an overall rating of **Strength** or **Area Needing Improvement (ANI)** is assigned to each of the 23 items incorporated in the seven outcomes depending on the percentage of cases that receive a Strength rating in the onsite case review. An item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 95 percent of the applicable cases reviewed are rated as Strength. Performance ratings for each of the seven outcomes are based on item ratings for each case. A Service Area may be rated as having **"Substantially Achieved"**, **"Partially Achieved"**, or **"Not Achieved"** the outcome. The determination of whether a Service Area is in substantial conformity with a particular outcome is based on the percentage of cases that were determined to have Substantially Achieved that outcome. In order for a Service Area to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95 percent of the cases reviewed must be rated as having Substantially Achieved the outcome. The standard for substantial conformity is based on the standard set for the Federal CFSR. The standards are based on the belief that because child welfare agencies work with our country's most vulnerable children and families, only the highest

standards of performance should be acceptable. The focus of the CFSR process is on continuous quality improvement; standards are set high to ensure ongoing attention to the goal of achieving positive outcomes for children and families with regard to safety, permanency, and well-being.

A Service Area that is not in substantial conformity with a particular outcome must work with their local CQI team to develop and implement a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) to address the areas of concern associated with that outcome.

Key CFSR Findings Regarding Outcomes

The 10th Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Western Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. Although the service area did not achieve substantial conformity with any of the seven CFSR outcomes, the service area did achieve overall ratings of Strength for the individual indicators pertaining to the following seven items: Item 1 (timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment), Item 5 (foster care re-entries), Item 6 (stability of foster care placement), Item 8 (reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relative), Item 10 (other planned living arrangement), Item 11 (proximity of foster care placement), and Item 12 (placement with siblings).

The 10th Mini-CFSR also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regard to Permanency Outcome 1 (children have permanency and stability in their living situations), which was Substantially Achieved in only 25% of the cases reviewed. The lowest ratings within this outcome were for Item 7 (permanency goal for child) which was rated as a Strength in 37.5% of the applicable cases and Item 9 (adoption) which rated as a Strength in 33.3% of the applicable cases.

Additionally, concerns were identified with regard to Permanency Outcome 2 (the continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children), which was Substantially Achieved in only 37.5% of the cases reviewed. The lowest ratings within this outcome were for Item 13 (visiting with parents and siblings in foster care) which was rated as a Strength in 25% of the applicable cases; Item 14 (preserving connections) which rated as a Strength in 37.5% of the applicable cases; and Item 16 (relationship of child in care with parents) which was rated as a Strength in 50% of the applicable cases.

Concerns were also identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 3 (children receive appropriate services to meet their physical and mental health needs). This outcome was substantially achieved in 40% of the cases reviewed. Within Well-Being Outcome 3, the Western Service Area achieved a Strength rating of 50% for Item 22 (physical health of the child).

KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

I. SAFETY

Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

Status of Safety Outcome S1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	6	75%
Partially Achieved:	2	25%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	42.9%

Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment

In assessing Item 1, reviewers were to determine whether the response to a maltreatment report occurring during the period under review had been initiated in accordance with child welfare agency policy. A new intake tool was implemented in 2003, which is based upon a priority response model with Priority 1 calling for a response by the worker within 24 hours of the time that the report is received by DHHS. Priority 2 designated reports are to have face to face contact with the alleged victim by Protection and Safety within 0 to 5 days from the time the intake is received and Priority 3 has a response time of 0-10 days. Data is generated monthly to ensure compliance with the response times.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 1 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. The item was rated a Strength in 8 (100%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases and 4 in home cases)
 - In all eight cases, documentation in the case file showed that the timeframes for initiating investigations and making contact with child victims were met.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation in the case files reviewed supported that contact with children who were the subject of child maltreatment reports occurred in accordance with the timeframes for the priority assigned to the allegations.

Item 2: Repeat maltreatment

In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether there had been at least one substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment report during the period under review, and if so, whether another substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed report occurred within a 6 month period before or after the report identified. Cases were considered not applicable for assessment if the child or family had never had a maltreatment report.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 2 was applicable for 6 of the 14 cases. The item was rated a Strength in 4 (66.7%) of the applicable cases and as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 2 (33.3%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In two of the cases, there were no additional substantiated maltreatment reports within a 6 month period before or after the substantiated maltreatment report that was received during the period under review.
 - In one case, while there were two intakes received within six months, this case was rated as a strength as the two reports were of unrelated circumstances.
- (1 in home case)
 - In this case, there were no additional substantiated maltreatment reports within a 6 month period before or after the substantiated maltreatment report that was received during the period under review.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, it was identified that repeat maltreatment did occur. Reviewers noted that there were two substantiated reports of maltreatment during the period under review, one in August 2011 and the other in November 2011. Both of the substantiated reports of maltreatment involved similar circumstances.
- (1 in home case)
 - In this case, there were two substantiated maltreatment reports during the period under review, one in April 2011 and one in June 2011. Both reports pertained to similar concerns of unsanitary living conditions and maltreatment of the child.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☒ It is noted that both of the cases that were rated as an area needing improvement for Item 2 also rated as an area needing improvement for Item 4. This may indicate a correlation between insufficient risk and safety assessments and repeat maltreatment.

Outcome S2: *Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.*

Status of Safety Outcome S2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	9	64.3%
Partially Achieved:	2	14.3%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	3	21.4%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal

For this item, reviewers were to assess whether in responding to a substantiated / inconclusive / petition to be filed maltreatment report or risk of harm, the agency made diligent efforts to provide services to families to prevent removal of children from their homes while at the same time ensuring their safety.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 3 was applicable for 9 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 8 (88.9%) of the applicable cases and as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (11.1%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In both cases, the child was reunified during the period under review and services were provided to ensure the child's safety and prevent re-entry into foster care.
- (6 in home cases)
 - In all six of these cases, documentation indicated that in home safety and other services including family support, individual and family therapy, tracker services, and school intervention, were provided in order to protect the children and prevent their entry into foster care.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In one case, a maltreatment report was received regarding concerns of sexual abuse. The child remained in the home of the alleged perpetrator and no services were put in place until a month later when the child was removed from the home as an uncontrollable juvenile.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ All children in the home should be evaluated to determine what services are needed to protect the children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care.
- ☑ If there are safety concerns related to the parent/step parent, then the parent/step parent should not be left in charge of managing safety for their children and safety plans should include how safety will be maintained for the children if they continue to have contact with the parent/step parent.

Item 4: Risk of harm to child

The assessment of Item 4 required reviewers to determine whether DHHS had made, or was making, diligent efforts to reduce the risk of harm to the children involved in each case. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the agency terminated the child's parent's rights as a means of decreasing risk of harm for the child (for example, a termination of parental rights would prevent a child from being returned to a home in which the child would be at risk) and has taken action to minimize other risks to the child (for example, preventing contact with individuals who pose a risk to the child's safety). If a case is/was open for services for a reason other than a court substantiated, inconclusive, petition to be filed or unfounded report of abuse or neglect, or apparent risk of harm to the child(ren) (for example, a juvenile justice case), reviewers were to document this information and rate the item as not applicable. Note, however,

that for a child(ren) noted as a “child in need of supervision” or “delinquent”, reviewers were to explore and determine whether there was a risk of harm to the child, in addition to the other reasons the case may have been opened, prior to rating it as not applicable. Cases were not applicable for assessment of this item if there was no current or prior risk of harm to the children in the family.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 4 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 9 (64.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 5 (35.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In these five cases, there was sufficient documentation to show initial assessments and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed for the target child while in foster care and for the other children remaining in the home. Documentation also indicated that risk and safety assessments were formally or informally completed and safety plans were adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.
- (4 in home cases)
 - In all four of these cases, there was sufficient documentation to show that initial and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed both formally and informally while the children were placed in the care of their parents and that safety plans were adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In one case, reviewers were unable to find documentation of any risk or safety assessments, formal or informal, during the period under review. Reviewers also found no documentation of a safety plan in this case.
 - In another case, there was no documentation of ongoing risk or safety assessments.
 - In one case, there was no indication of formal or informal risk or safety assessments during the period under review. Reviewers noted that there were not updates to safety plans with changes in the child’s placement. It is also noted that in this case, there was no documentation to indicate that safety or risk was assessed for the two children who remained in the family home.
- (2 in home cases)
 - In one case, reviewers found that while an initial assessment was completed, there was no documentation of ongoing risk or safety assessments being completed.
 - In one case, initial and ongoing safety assessments were completed solely based on the circumstances of the home of the child’s father. There is no information to indicate the agency assessed the child’s risk or safety in the mother’s home, which is the child’s primary residence.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ The Nebraska Safety Intervention System (Safety Model) should be utilized to assess risk and improve safety interventions with children and families. Reviewers found that while the Nebraska Safety Intervention System was utilized for the majority of initial assessments, it was not used as consistently for ongoing safety assessments. Reviewers relied on informal assessments documented during face to face contacts and Family Team Meetings during their review of this item.
- ☑ Workers need to continually assess risk and safety during face to face contacts with the children, parent(s) and foster parents. These assessments should be well documented in the narratives provided for required contacts with the children, parents and foster parents.
- ☑ Safety determination should be made by considering case circumstances absent of department intervention. Safety plans should be implemented in cases in which the children are determined to be unsafe in the current circumstances and without intervention from the department.
- ☑ Safety plans should continually be monitored and updated as circumstances change and as safety threats increase or decrease.

II. PERMANENCY

Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

Status of Permanency Outcome P1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	2	25%
Partially Achieved:	6	75%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	42.9%

Item 5: Foster care re-entries

Reviewers rated this assessment a Strength if during the period under review a child did not have an entry into care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care. Reviewers also rated this item as a Strength if a re-entry was an isolated incident during which the agency did what was reasonable to manage the risk following reunification but the child re-entered care for another reason (for example, the death of a parent). Reviewers rated this item as an Area Needing Improvement if re-entries occurring within a 12-month period were due to the same general reasons or same perpetrators. Reviewers rated this item as Not Applicable if : (1) the child entered foster care before, and remained in foster care during, the period under review; or (2) the child entered foster care before, and exited foster care during, the period under review and there was not another entry into foster care during the period under review.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 5 was applicable for 2 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all of the 2 (100.0%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 foster care case)
 - In both cases, the child did enter foster care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care.

Item 6: Stability of foster care placement

In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether the child experienced multiple placement changes during the period under review, and if so, whether the changes in placement settings were necessary to achieve the child's permanency goal or meet the child's service needs.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 6 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 8 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (8 foster care cases)
 - In six of the cases, documentation showed that the child experienced only one placement setting during the period under review. In all six cases, the reviewers found that the child's foster care placement was stable.
 - In two of the cases, while the child experienced more than one placement change, documentation clearly showed that the placement changes were necessary in order to provide for the child's needs.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☒ Reasons for placement changes were clearly documented in the case file.
- ☒ Reviewers were able to determine that the placement changes were in the best interest of the child and necessary to achieve the child's permanency goals and / or meet the child's specific needs.

Item 7: Permanency goal for child

In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal for the child in a timely manner, including filing for termination of parental rights when relevant. Reviewers examined the appropriateness of a goal that ultimately rules out adoption, guardianship, or return to family. Reviewers assessed whether the child's best interests were thoroughly considered by DHHS in setting a goal of other planned living arrangement, and that such a decision is /was continually reviewed for ongoing appropriateness. Cases were assigned a rating of Strength for this item when reviewers determined that DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal in a timely manner. Cases were assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement when goals of reunification were not changed in a timely manner when it was apparent that reunification was unlikely to happen, termination of parental rights was not filed when the child had been foster care for 15 of the past 22 months and no compelling reasons were noted in the file, or the goal established for the child was not appropriate. Cases were identified as Not Applicable if the child was not in foster care.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 7 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 3 (37.5%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (62.5%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In all three cases, the child's permanency goals were established in a timely manner, documented in the case file, and were appropriate to the child's needs for permanency.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In two cases, the permanency goal was not established in a timely manner. In one case the child had been in out of home placement for 3 months and in the other case the child had been in out of home placement for 4 months prior to the goal being established. Permanency goals should be established within 60 days from the child's entry into care.
 - In one case, the child's permanency goal was established 9 months following her original removal. Following the child's original removal, the child was reunified and then later removed and is currently placed out of home; however family preservation was established as the permanency goal. Reviewers determined that the permanency goal was not established timely and is not appropriate based on current circumstances.
 - In one case, reviewers found that timely action was not taken to change the permanency goal from reunification to adoption as the child had been in placement for sixteen months before adoption was made the primary goal. Additionally, this child has been in out of home placement for more than 15 out of 22 months, and while documentation shows that the father has relinquished, there is no documentation to show that Termination of Parental Rights has been filed against the mother.
 - In another case, the child had been in placement for more than 15 out of 22 months. There had been no request for Termination of Parental Rights, nor was there documentation in the case file regarding an exception or compelling reason for not filing for Termination of Parental Rights.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Permanency goals need to be identified in the case file. Documentation of permanency goals should accurately reflect goals that are being addressed for the child.
- ☑ The first permanency goal of the child should be established within 60 days from the child's entry into foster care.
- ☑ Case file documentation needs to include all information regarding termination of parental rights for children who have been in foster care at least 15 out of the most recent 22 months. Documentation should include evidence of a petition for termination of parental rights and / or documentation of compelling reasons for not filing for termination of parental rights.

Item 8: Reunification, Guardianship or Permanent Placement with Relatives

In assessing these cases reviewers determined whether DHHS had achieved children's goals of reunification, guardianship or placement with relatives in a timely manner. If the goals had not been achieved in a timely manner, reviewers determined whether DHHS had made diligent efforts to achieve the goals.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 8 was applicable for 3 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 3 (100%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In one case, documentation shows that reunification was achieved within 2 months of entry into foster care.
 - In one case, documentation shows that efforts were made both toward reunification and guardianship the guardianship was successfully achieved within 11 months of the child's entry into foster care.
 - In one case, documentation in the case file shows concerted efforts being made to achieve the permanency goal of reunification in a timely manner.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ The agency should be making active efforts to achieve ALL permanency goals (primary and concurrent goals) established for the child.
- ☑ If the child has been in foster care for longer than 12 months, documentation should also include information regarding barriers or particular circumstances to justify the delay in achieving the child's permanency goal.

Item 9: Adoption

In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether appropriate and timely efforts (within 24 months of the most recent entry into foster care) had been or were being made to achieve finalized adoption.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 9 was applicable for 3 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 1 (33.3%) of the applicable cases and as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 2 (66.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (1 foster care case)
 - In one case, documentation shows that the agency made concerted efforts toward the permanency goal of adoption and that this goal was achieved timely within 21 months of the child's entry into foster care.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In one case, reunification was identified as the primary goal and adoption was established as a concurrent goal. There was no documentation of any efforts being made toward the concurrent goal of adoption.
 - In one case, the child has been in out of home care for 19 months. While efforts are currently being made toward adoption, documentation indicates that adoption will not be achieved timely, within 24 months of removal, as ICWA requirements were not followed at the start of the case.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☒ The agency should be making active efforts to achieve ALL permanency goals (primary and concurrent goals) established for the child. Reviewers had difficulty finding information to support the agency efforts to achieve concurrent goals that were established.

Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement

Reviewers determined whether the agency had made or was making diligent efforts to assist children in attaining their goals related to other planned permanent living arrangements (Independent Living, Self-Sufficiency or Family Preservation).

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 10 was applicable for 1 of the 14 cases. This item rated as a strength in 1 (100%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, there was evidence of concerted efforts to achieve the child's primary goal of independent living.

Status of Permanency Outcome P2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	3	37.5%
Partially Achieved:	5	62.5%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	42.9%

Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement

Reviewers were to determine whether the child's foster care setting was in close proximity to the child's parents or close relatives. Cases determined to be not applicable were those in which termination of parental rights had been completed prior to the period under review, or in which contact with parents was not considered to be in the child's best interest.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 11 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 8 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (8 foster care cases)
 - In five cases, the child was placed in the same community as their parents.
 - In one case, the child was placed in close proximity, within 40 miles of the child's mother. This placement was close enough to facilitate frequent contact.
 - In two cases, while placement was not in close proximity to the child's parents and home community, documentation showed that the placement was in the closest available facility which could meet the child's needs.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation included information regarding the location of foster care placement and its proximity to the parents(s).
- ☑ The review identified that whenever possible, children are placed in close proximity of their parents.
- ☑ In cases where placement was not within close proximity to the child's family, it was identified that this occurred because an appropriate placement was not available in the child's home community and that the closest appropriate placement was utilized.

Item 12: Placement with siblings

Reviewers were to determine whether siblings were or had been placed together and if not, was separation necessary to meet the needs (service or safety needs) of one or more of the children.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 12 was applicable for 5 of the 14 cases. This item was rated a strength in all 5 (100.0%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care case)
 - In three cases, the target child was placed with their siblings in the same foster care setting.
 - In one case, the target child was placed together with two siblings. A third sibling was placed separately. The case file contained clear documentation showing that this separate placement was necessary due to this child's aggressive behaviors toward siblings.
 - In one case, documentation shows that the child's sibling was placed out of state in detention and therefore placement with her sibling would not have been appropriate.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation explained the agency's efforts to place all siblings together.
- ☑ Documentation clearly addressed the circumstances or reasons for not placing all siblings together.

Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care

In assessing this item reviewers determined whether DHHS had or was making diligent efforts to facilitate visitations between children in foster care and their parents and siblings. Reviewers also determined whether these visits typically occurred with sufficient frequency to meet the needs of the children and families. Non applicable cases were those where the child had no siblings in foster care, if the parents could not be located, and/or if visitation with the parents was considered not in the best interests of the child. Reviewers rated this item for the period under review based on the individual needs of the child and family, rather than on the DHHS policy regarding visitation. The DHHS visitation guidebook recommends a minimum of one visit every two weeks between child and parent unless it would not be in the child's best interest because the parent is the perpetrator of severe physical abuse or sexual abuse. DHHS Policy requires that siblings placed separately must have a minimum of one visit per month. Other forms of communication including phone calls and letters are strongly encouraged.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 13 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 2 (25%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 6 (75%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In one case, documentation in the case file shows that the agency supported frequent visitation between the child and the child's parents.
 - In another case, documentation shows that the child had visits with her mother several times a week. In this same case the agency made efforts to locate and involve the father; however, when the father was located, he reported that he had never had contact with the child and stated he wanted to relinquish his parental rights.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (6 foster care cases)
 - In two cases, while there is documentation of sufficient visitation between the child and their mother, there were no concerted efforts to locate the father of the child or to encourage visitation between the father and the child.
 - In one case, while documentation shows sufficient visitation between the child and father as well as the child and sibling placed in foster care, there is no indication of any visits or other contact between the child and his mother. There is also no documentation of efforts by the agency to promote contact between the child and his mother.
 - In one case, the child's mother was deceased and there was no documentation regarding visits between the child and her father.
 - In another case, there was no documentation that any visitation occurred between the child and her parents.
 - In one case, while documentation shows that visits between the child and their mother, father, and siblings in foster care were of sufficient frequency, there was no documentation regarding the quality of visits or efforts to ensure the quality of these visits.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Visitation with the child and his/her parents (mother and /or father when applicable) and the child and his/ her siblings in foster care should be clearly documented in the case file.
- ☑ Documentation should describe both the frequency and quality of visits.

Item 14: Preserving connections

Reviewers determined whether DHHS had or was making diligent efforts to preserve the child's primary connection and characteristics while in foster care. Reviewers had to make a professional judgment about the child's primary connections and then explore whether those connections have been preserved through case planning and service delivery.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 14 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 3 (37.5%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (62.5%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In one case, the child was placed in a relative foster home in their own community which allowed for the child to remain at the same school maintain contact with extended family.
 - In one case, reviewers found documentation showing that the child was able to maintain connections through continued involvement in Awana, vacation bible school and YMCA day camp.
 - In one case, the child was able to remain in her home with her grandfather as her foster parent while her father was incarcerated. The child was able to maintain connections to her community, remain in the same school, continue involvement in Upward Bound, and continue her relationship with her mentor.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In four cases, reviewers found that there was either no documentation or insufficient documentation regarding efforts to identify or maintain important connections for the child while in foster care.
 - In one case, the child has tribal affiliations and their enrollment was verified by the tribe. Other than contacting the tribe to verify enrollment, there is no other documentation of efforts to involve the tribe or to notify the tribe of its right to intervene in court proceedings. Additionally, there is no documentation that any efforts have been made to maintain or foster cultural ties to the child's tribe.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation needs to identify the child's important connections and efforts made by the department to preserve those connections.
- ☑ Documentation should include information to support that sufficient inquiry was conducted with both mother and father and relatives to determine whether or not the child may be a member of or eligible for membership in a Native American tribe.

Item 15: Relative placement

Reviewers had to focus on the title IV-E provision that requires States to consider giving preference to placing the child with relatives, and determine whether the State considered such a placement and how (for example, seeking out and evaluating the child's relatives). Relatives include non-custodial parents, such as fathers not in the home, if applicable to the case.

Reviewers had to determine the extent to which the agency identified relatives who had some reasonable degree of relationship with the child and with whom the child might reside. There did not need to be in the case record a formal evaluation of relatives with whom the child might reside, but for reviewers to have answered "yes" evidence must exist, through either the case documentation or the case interviews, that relatives were evaluated and considered. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if (1) the agency assessed the child's needs and determined that he/she required special services *and* (2) the agency assessed potential relative placements and determined that the relative placements did not have the capacity to meet the child's needs.

Reviewers rated this item as a Strength unless no efforts were made to locate or identify relatives for placement, or placement with a family known to the child. Reviewers rated this item as not applicable if (1) the agency determined upon the child's initial entry into care that his/her needs required residential treatment services and a relative placement would be inappropriate, or (2) if relatives were unable to be identified despite the agency's diligent efforts to do so, or in situations such as abandonment in which the identity of the parents and relatives remains unknown despite efforts to identify them. Reviewers were to check not applicable if the child was placed with relatives.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 15 was applicable for 6 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 4 (66.7%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 2 (33.3%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In three cases, the child was placed with relatives and documentation supports that this placement is stable and meeting the child's needs.
 - In one case, documentation in the case file shows that sufficient efforts were made to identify possible relative placements; however no relatives were found to be appropriate placement options for the child.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In these two cases, it was noted that there were no documented efforts to identify either maternal or paternal family members.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Both maternal and paternal relatives should be identified.
- ☑ Efforts to identify and pursue appropriate relative placements should be clearly documented in the case file.

Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents

In assessing this item, reviewers determined if there was evidence of a strong, emotionally supportive relationship between the child in foster care and the child's parents during the period under review. Reviewers assigned a rating of Strength for this item when there was evidence of regular visitation between parent and child. Reviewers assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement when they determined the agency had not made diligent efforts to support the child's relationship with the father or mother. A case was considered not applicable if a relationship with the child's parents was contrary to the child's safety or best interest during the period under review.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 16 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 4 (50%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (50%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care case)
 - In these four cases, documentation showed that the agency had made efforts to support and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the target child and his parents.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In one case, there was no documentation of efforts by the agency to support and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child and his parents.
 - In two cases, while there was documentation of efforts to promote a positive relationship between the child and his/her mother, there was no documentation regarding any attempts to support and maintain a positive relationship between the child and his/her father.
 - In one case, while there was documentation of efforts to promote a positive relationship between the child and his/her mother, there was no documentation regarding any attempts to support and maintain a positive relationship between the child and his/her father.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation should clearly describe the agency's efforts to provide opportunities or to support additional activities to promote, strengthen, or maintain parent-child relationships.

III. WELL-BEING

Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	8	57.1%
Partially Achieved:	5	35.7%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	7.1%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents

In assessing Item 17, reviewers were to determine whether DHHS adequately assessed the needs of children, parents and foster parents AND provided the services to meet those needs.

Reviewers rated Item 17 as a strength if (1) a needs assessment was conducted for the child(ren), parents and foster parents, and (2) appropriate services were provided in relation to the identified needs of the target child in foster care cases, or for all children in in-home cases. Education and physical or mental health services to the target child were not rated for this item (these are rated in Items 21, 22, and 23). Reviewers had to document whether these services were provided to parents.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 17 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 8 (57.1%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 6 (42.9%) of the applicable cases. The overall rating for Item 17 is based on the combination of the following three sub-items:

Item 17a: Needs Assessment and Services to Children: The assessment of Item 17a was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 12 (85.7%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 2 (14.3%).

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
 - In these seven cases, the needs of the children were assessed in a variety of ways including Family Team Meetings, OJS evaluation, initial and ongoing safety assessments, and caseworker visits with the child, parents, and foster parents.
 - In these seven cases, the needs of the children were met through providing assistance with transportation, out of home placement, family support, visitation supervision, and case management. Reviewers found no unmet needs for the children in these cases.

- (5 in home cases)
 - In these five cases, the needs of all of the children were assessed both formally and informally through initial safety assessment, during Family Team Meetings, and during worker contacts with the child, family, and safety plan participants.
 - In these five cases, identified needs of the children were met through assistance with family support services, drug testing, electronic monitoring, and tracker services. Reviewers found no unmet needs for the children in these cases.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, there was no indication through documentation in the case file or through interviews that any formal or informal ongoing assessments of the child's needs were completed during the period under review.
- (1 in home case)
 - In this case, there was no documentation in the case file to show that the child's needs had been assessed. Additionally, none of the information gathered through gathered through interviews indicated that the child's needs were assessed.

Item 17b: Needs Assessment and Services to Parents: The assessment of Item 17b was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 9 (64.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (35.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In these five cases, the needs of the parents were assessed on an ongoing basis using both formal and informal means including drug and alcohol assessments, parenting assessments, Family Team Meetings and regular monthly contact with the caseworker.
 - In these five cases, identified needs were met through individual and family therapy, family support services, supervised visitation, parenting classes, random drug testing, drug and alcohol treatment, and assistance with transportation for visitation.
- (4 in home cases)
 - In these four cases, the needs of the parents were assessed through the following methods: family team meetings, and during monthly worker contacts with the parents and children.
 - In these four cases, identified needs were met through the following services: family support services, individual and family therapy, drug and alcohol testing, and education to develop parenting skills.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In two cases, the agency assessed the needs of the mother; however, there is no documentation or information to indicate that the agency made concerted efforts to assess the needs of the father.

- In one case, the agency assessed the needs of the father; however there is no documentation or information to indicate that the agency made concerted efforts to assess the needs of the mother.
- (2 in home cases)
 - In one case, the agency assessed the needs of the father, but did not sufficiently assess the needs of the mother and did not provide services to the mother.
 - In another case, the agency assessed the needs of the mother; however, there is no documentation or information to support that the agency assessed the needs of the father or provided services to meet the father's needs.

Item 17c: Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents: The assessment of Item 17c was applicable for 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 6 (85.7%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (14.3%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (6 foster care cases)
 - In all six of these cases, it was noted that the needs of the foster parents were assessed informally through involvement in Family Team Meetings, phone calls, and monthly worker visits with the foster parents. In all cases the needs of the foster parents were found to have been met.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, the reviewers were unable to find information to indicate that the needs of the foster parents were assessed or that services were provided to meet their needs.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Reviewers noted that in several of the cases, there was not sufficient documentation to support that needs were assessed and appropriate services were provided. Reviewers had to rely upon information gathered during the interviews to rate this item.
- ☑ Reviewers identified that in the majority of the cases the agency performed well in terms of assessing, identifying, and meeting the needs of the child.
- ☑ In terms of the parents, reviewers noted that in some cases the needs of one of the parents were identified and addressed while the other parent's needs were not. Most often, this occurred when one of the parents was absent from the home and it is the absent parent whose needs are not consistently being assessed, identified, or met.
- ☑ Caseworker contacts and Family Team Meetings were the most frequently noted methods of assessing needs for children, parents and foster parents.

Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning

In assessing this item reviewers were to determine whether the agency actively involved the parent(s), guardian, child(ren) and other people identified by the family in the case planning activities relevant to the current case plan. A determination of involvement in case planning required that a parent (guardian) and the child (older than 8 and not incapacitated) had actively participated in identifying the services and goals for the case plan.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 18 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 9 (64.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (35.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In all five cases, the reviewers noted that the case worker made active efforts to involve or encourage the child (if age and developmentally appropriate) and both parents to be involved in case planning through family team meetings and caseworker contacts with the child and parents.
- (4 in home cases)
 - In all four cases, the reviewers noted that the case worker made active efforts to involve or encourage the child (if age and developmentally appropriate) and both parents (if applicable) to be involved in case planning through family team meetings and caseworker contacts with the child and parents.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In two cases, while reviewers found that the child and the mother were involved in case planning; there was no documentation of efforts to involve the father of the child in case planning.
 - In one case, it was found that while the child and the father were involved in case planning, there was no documentation to show that efforts were made to involve the mother of the child in case planning.
- (2 in home cases)
 - In one case, reviewers found that while the mother and child were involved in case planning, the father was not involved in case planning and there was no indication of concerted efforts to involve the father in case planning.
 - In one case, the father was involved in case planning; however there is no documentation of efforts to involve the mother, in case planning. In this case, the child's parents are divorced. The child came to the attention of the department due to safety factors present when child was with his father; however the child's primary caretaker is his mother.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation should clearly show concerted efforts by the agency to involve the parents (mother and/or father as applicable) in case planning activities.
- ☑ The reviewers identified that case planning is primarily occurring during monthly contacts with the parents and child as well as during Family Team Meetings.

Item 19: Worker visits with child

Reviewers were to determine the typical pattern of visits between the worker and child and if these visits were sufficient to ensure adequate monitoring of the child's safety and well being. Reviewers were also to determine whether visits focused on issues pertinent to case planning, service delivery, and achievement of the goals.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 19 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 12 (85.7%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 2 (14.3%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
 - In all seven of these cases, face to face visits between the case worker were found to be of sufficient frequency and were also found to be of sufficient quality as the caseworker addressed issues of safety, permanency and well being as well as case planning with the child.
- (5 in home cases)
 - In all five of these cases, it was found that the caseworker had face to face contacts with all children at least once per month. The visits were found to meet quality as they involved issues of safety, permanency and well-being.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, it was found that visits with the child were sufficient in frequency, occurring on a monthly basis; however the quality of the visits were found to be insufficient as information provided indicated that the worker visited with the child only 5 minutes per session. The indicated time spent with the child was not sufficient to address issues of safety, permanency, and well-being of the child.
- (1 in home case)
 - In one case, there was no documentation of worker visits with the child. Information gathered through interviews revealed that the family knew of only one time, during the 3 months the case was open, that the caseworker visited with the child. In addition to being insufficient in frequency, visitation was found to be insufficient in quality as it was not private and did not take place in the child's home.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation should address the frequency of worker's visits with the child. If face to face contact between the worker and the child was less than monthly, documentation should include reasons why the contact did not occur.
- ☑ Documentation should include enough information to determine the quality of the visit and to show that the visit was sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety, permanency and well-being of the child and to promote achievement of case plan goals.

Item 20: Worker visits with parents

Reviewers were to assess whether the caseworker had sufficient face to face contact with parents to encourage attainment of their children's permanency goal while ensuring safety and well being. Cases that were considered not applicable were those in which there is no plan for further involvement between the parents and the agency or the parents and the child, and the child is not in a permanent home.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 20 was applicable for all of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 8 (57.1%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 6 (42.9%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In these five cases, reviewers found that the visits with the parents were of sufficient frequency; occurring at least monthly. Visits with the parents were also determined to be of sufficient quality as the caseworker and parents discussed issues pertaining to the permanency and well being of the child.
- (3 in home cases)
 - In these three cases, documentation in the case file and information gathered through interviews showed that the caseworker visits with both the mother and the father were sufficient in frequency and quality.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In one case, while visits with the mother were found to be of sufficient frequency and quality, there were not face to face visits with the father and it was determined that sufficient efforts were not made to locate or involve the father.
 - In one case, there was no contact between the worker and the child's father. While there was contact between the worker and the child's mother, it was determined that contact was not sufficient in frequency or quality.
 - In another case, there was no contact between the worker and the child's mother and the contact between the worker and the child's father was found to be of insufficient frequency and quality.
- (3 in home cases)
 - In two of the cases, the reviewers determined that the worker met with the children's mother at least once a month and the quality of the visits were sufficient to address safety, permanency and well-being of the child. However, in both cases, there was no evidence that the worker had any face to face contacts with the children's father during the period under review.
 - In one case, while there were monthly quality visits with the child's father, there were no visits with the child's mother.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Lack of documentation is a significant contributing factor for not achieving Item 20. Worker visits with the parents (mother and/or father as determined to be applicable and appropriate) should be clearly documented to show both frequency and quality of visits.
- ☑ In out of home cases where the parents do not reside together, the agency tends to achieve sufficient contact with the parent they are seeking to reunify the child with, while less than sufficient contact or no contact is made with the other parent.
- ☑ For the majority of in-home cases, when contact with the child was sufficient, contact with the parent or parents residing in the home with the child was also sufficient, however contact was not sufficient with the absent parent.

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	9	75%
Partially Achieved:	0	0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	3	25%
Not Applicable:	2	14.3%

Item 21: Educational needs of the child

When addressing educational issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers considered whether the educational needs are/were relevant to the reason why the agency is/was involved with the family, and whether the need to address educational issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers rated Item 21 as not applicable.) Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if (1) the agency made extensive efforts to address the child's educational needs and the school system was unresponsive, especially if the problems are with a local school or jurisdiction; (2) if the child(ren)'s educational needs were assessed and addressed, including cases where the educational records were missing and the reasons why; or (3) if the agency conducted an assessment of educational issues and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for educational services.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 21 was applicable for 12 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 9 (75%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 3 (25%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (6 foster care and 3 in home cases)
 - In these nine cases, documentation in the case file showed that the educational needs of the child were assessed and that the child received appropriate services in order to meet their unique educational needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases and 1 in home case)
 - In these three cases, there is no documentation of assessments of the target child's educational needs and no information regarding the child's educational progress.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☒ Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's educational needs.
- ☒ Documentation should detail what the child's educational needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB3:

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	4	40%
Partially Achieved:	5	50%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	10%
Not Applicable:	4	28.6%

Item 22: Physical health of the child

When addressing health issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers considered whether the physical health needs are/were relevant to the reason why the agency is/was involved with the family and whether the need to address physical health issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers rated this item as not applicable.) For example, if a child became known to the agency and was determined to be in need of in-home services at least partly as a result of physical abuse or sexual abuse, then it is reasonable to expect the agency to provide services to ensure that the child receives the appropriate physical health services. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the agency conducted an assessment of physical health and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for physical health services.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 22 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 4 (50%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 4 (50%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In all four cases, the case file contained documentation that the child received periodic, age appropriate physical and dental health examinations, and that any identified health needs were met with appropriate services.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In two cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of a current assessment of the child's physical and dental health needs.
 - In two cases, while there was documentation of a current physical exam, there is not documentation of a current dental exam for the child.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's physical and dental health needs.
- ☑ Documentation should detail what the child's physical and dental health needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

Item 23: Mental health of the child

Reviewers were to determine whether during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child(ren). Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the agency conducted an assessment of the child's mental health and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for mental health services. If there was a need for services then they were offered.

Review Findings: The assessment of Item 23 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 6 (75%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 2 (25%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In these five cases, the case file contained documentation to show that the child's mental/behavioral health needs were assessed and that efforts were made to provide appropriate services to meet each identified need.
- (1 in home case)
 - In this case, there was documentation showing that the mental health needs of all applicable children in the home were assessed and that services were provided to meet all of the children's mental health needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, there is no documentation of mental health assessments being completed during the period under review. Reviewers noted that there is documentation of the medications that the child is prescribed, however there is a lack of documentation as to what the child's mental health issues or needs are.
- (1 in home case)
 - In this case, there is documentation that the child struggled with substance abuse. However there is no documentation of mental health assessments being completed during the period under review, nor is there documentation of services provided to address the child's mental and behavioral health needs.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's mental/behavior needs.
- ☑ Documentation should detail what the child's mental/behavioral needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

WSA Results

Case Sample: Mini CFSR Review – April 2012

Type of Review: 10th Mini CFSR

Report Type: Western Service Area

Number of Reviews: 14

Review Period: April 1st, 2011 – April 1st, 2012

PERFORMANCE ITEM RESULTS

Performance Item		Item Ratings (#)			Item Ratings (%)		
		S	ANI	N/A	S	ANI	N/A
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations	8	0	6	100%	0%	42.86%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	4	2	8	66.7%	33.3%	57.1%
Item 3:	Services to family	8	1	5	88.9%	11.1%	35.7%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	9	5	0	64.3%	35.7%	0%
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	2	0	12	100%	0%	85.7%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	8	0	6	100%	0%	42.9%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	3	5	6	37.5%	62.5%	42.9%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	3	0	11	100%	0%	78.5%
Item 9:	Adoption	1	2	11	33.3%	66.7%	78.6%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	1	0	13	100%	0%	92.9%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	8	0	6	100%	0%	42.9%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	5	0	9	100%	0%	64.3%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	2	6	6	25%	75%	42.9%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	3	5	6	37.5%	62.5%	42.9%
Item 15:	Relative placement	4	2	8	66.7%	33.3%	57.1%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	4	4	6	50%	50%	42.9%
Item 17:	Needs and services	8	6	0	57.1%	42.9%	0%
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	9	5	0	64.3%	35.7%	0%
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	12	2	0	85.7%	14.3%	0%
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	8	6	0	57.1%	42.9%	0%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	9	3	2	75%	25%	14.3%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	4	4	6	50%	50%	42.9%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	6	2	6	75%	25%	42.9%

OUTCOME RESULTS

Performance Outcome	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
	SA	PA	NA	N/A	SA	PA	NA	N/A
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	6	2	0	6	75%	25%	0%	42.9%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	9	2	3	0	64.3%	14.3%	21.4%	0%
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	2	6	0	6	25%	75%	0%	42.9%
Permanency 2 (Items 11-16)	3	5	0	6	37.5%	62.5%	0%	42.9%
Well-being 1 (Items 17-20)	8	5	1	0	57.1%	35.7%	7.1%	0%
Well-being 2 (Item 21)	9	0	3	2	75%	0%	25%	14.3%
Well-being 3 (Items 22-23)	4	5	1	4	40%	50%	10%	28.6%

KEY:

N/A = Not Applicable

PA = Partially Achieved

NACH = Not Achieved

S = Strength

SA = Substantially Achieved

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

CFSR - Western Service Area (Item & Outcome Quarterly Results)

REPORT CODES: Items 1 to 20, 22 and 23

Blue	90% or Above
Yellow	85% - 89.9%
Red	below 50%

** For reference - a list and description of CFSR items and Outcomes is found on the following page.*

Report CODES: Item 21 and ALL OUTCOMES

Blue	95% or Above
Yellow	90% - 94.9%
Red	below 50%

Report Quarter	1st Qtr 2010	2nd Qtr 2010	3rd Qtr 2010	4th Qtr 2010	5th Qtr 2011	6th Qtr 2011	7th Qtr 2011	8th Qtr 2011	9th Qtr 2012	10th Qtr 20112
Period Under Review	Jan 09- Jan10	Apr 09- Apr 10	Jul 09- Jul 10	Oct 09- Oct 10	Jan 10- Jan 11	Apr 10- Apr 11	Jul 10- Jul 11	Oct 10- Oct 11	Jan 11- Jan 12	Apr 11- Apr 12
Number of Cases	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Item 1	100%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%	50.0%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%
Item 2	75%	50%	100%	67%	100%	100%	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%	66.7%
Outcome: S1	80%	80%	100%	60%	100%	100%	50.0%	100.0%	66.7%	75.0%
Item 3	71%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	90.9%	100.0%	90.0%	88.9%
Item 4	57%	71%	43%	50%	71%	79%	64.3%	85.7%	71.4%	64.3%
Outcome: S2	57%	71%	43%	50%	71%	79%	64.3%	85.7%	71.4%	64.3%
Item 5	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 6	100%	100%	75%	75%	88%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 7	44%	75%	38%	63%	63%	50%	37.5%	50.0%	62.5%	37.5%
Item 8	83%	100%	100%	67%	100%	83%	83.3%	50.0%	85.7%	100.0%
Item 9	50%	100%	50%	100%	33%	N/A	33.3%	100.0%	80.0%	33.3%
Item 10	100%	33%	100%	50%	100%	100%	0.0%	N/A	N/A	100.0%
Outcome: P1	33%	75%	50%	50%	38%	50%	12.5%	37.5%	62.5%	75.0%
Item 11	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	88%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 12	100%	100%	50%	100%	0%	100%	100.0%	50.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Item 13	50%	67%	38%	71%	71%	50%	71.4%	50.0%	37.5%	25.0%
Item 14	78%	75%	100%	63%	63%	63%	42.9%	87.5%	87.5%	37.5%
Item 15	57%	100%	50%	75%	40%	100%	25.0%	83.3%	50.0%	66.7%
Item 16	38%	63%	50%	71%	71%	25%	66.7%	37.5%	14.4%	50.0%
Outcome: P2	44%	75%	38%	63%	50%	63%	62.5%	37.5%	37.5%	37.5%
Item 17	64%	50%	50%	36%	57%	29%	78.6%	87.5%	64.3%	57.1%
Item 18	50%	50%	29%	43%	85%	21%	69.2%	71.4%	64.3%	64.3%
Item 19	64%	79%	71%	86%	93%	93%	92.9%	92.9%	64.3%	85.7%
Item 20	43%	38%	29%	33%	62%	71%	69.2%	50.0%	46.2%	57.1%
Outcome: WB1	36%	50%	36%	21%	57%	64%	64.3%	78.6%	48.6%	57.1%
Item 21	64%	91%	60%	75%	78%	100%	83.3%	80.0%	90.9%	75.0%
Outcome: WB2	64%	91%	50%	75%	78%	100%	83.3%	80.0%	90.9%	75.0%
Item 22	83%	89%	67%	56%	80%	33%	100.0%	80.0%	44.4%	50.0%
Item 23	100%	100%	58%	88%	90%	92%	83.3%	75.0%	66.7%	75.0%
Outcome: WB3	83%	83%	50%	58%	75%	54%	84.6%	75.0%	38.5%	40.0%

CFSR

Items & Outcomes Description

SAFETY:

Safety Outcome #1: Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

- **Item 1** (Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment)
- **Item 2** (Repeat maltreatment)

Safety Outcome #2: Children are safely maintained in their homes, whenever possible and appropriate.

- **Item 3** (Services to family to protect child(ren) in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care)
- **Item 4** (Risk assessment and safety management)

PERMANENCY:

Permanency Outcome #1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

- **Item 5** (Foster care re-entries – did a child who entered foster care during the period under review re-enter within 12 months of a prior foster care episode)
- **Item 6** (Stability of Foster Care placement)
- **Item 7** (Permanency goal for child – were appropriate permanency goals established for the child in a timely manner)
- **Item 8** (Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives)
- **Item 9** (Adoption)
- **Item 10** (Other planned permanent living arrangement)

Permanency Outcome #2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

- **Item 11** (Proximity of foster care placement)
- **Item 12** (Placement with siblings)
- **Item 13** (Visits with parents and siblings in foster care)
- **Item 14** (Preserving connections – with child's neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, tribe, school, friends)
- **Item 15** (Relative placement)
- **Item 16** (Relationship of child in care with parents)

WELL-BEING

Well-Being Outcome #1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

- **Item 17** (Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents)
 - **Item 17A** (Services to meet the child's identified needs)
 - **Item 17B** (Services to meet parents' identified needs)
 - **Item 17C** (Services to meet the foster parents' identified needs)
- **Item 18** (Child and family involvement in case planning)
- **Item 19** (Worker visits with child)
- **Item 20** (Caseworker visits with parent)

Well-Being Outcome #2: Children received adequate services to meet their educational need.

- **Item 21** (Educational Needs of the child)

Well-Being #3: Children received adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

- **Item 22** (Physical health of the child)
- **Item 23** (Mental/behavioral health of the child)